



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

descending scale is composed of mind, soul, and the corporeal. 4. The elements of the created world are form and matter. This distinction applies to mind and soul, as well as to the corporeal. 5. The force which binds together these two opposing principles and gives to everything its being is the Unity peculiar to every individual thing. 6. This Unity has its origin in the supreme absolute Unity. 7. In everything there is an inherent striving for the greatest possible degree of being and accordingly for the greatest possible degree of Unity. 8. The ground for the inferiority of the created world to the creator is in the inferior degree of Unity. 9. The cause of this inferior degree of Unity lies in the nature of matter. The Neoplatonic character of these doctrines is on the surface; one will also mark at once the Aristotelian distinction between form and matter. Mediæval philosophers derived their knowledge of Neoplatonism from two sources, *viz.*, from the early Christian writers, especially Boethius and Augustine; on the other side from the Arabico-Jewish philosophy. Gundisalvi derived his knowledge of Arabic Neoplatonism from Ibn Gabirol (Avicebrol). In brief but clear fashion Correns has explained the historical position of this work in mediæval philosophy, besides giving us a good serviceable text with apparatus criticus. The series of "Beiträge" to the history of mediæval thought, of which this forms the first section of vol. i, promises under the general editorship of the learned Baeumker to be of great importance for the investigation of this neglected period of philosophy.

WILLIAM HAMMOND.

Genesis and Growth of Religion. The L. P. Stone Lectures for 1892 at Princeton Theological Seminary, New Jersey. By Rev. S. H. KELLOGG, D.D. New York and London, Macmillan & Co., 1892.

If Dr. Kellogg has by his earlier publications challenged the respect of scholars, his fame has not been lessened by the publication of the present series of Lectures. Rigidly conservative in tenor, they are the deliberate conclusions of one who deserves, by his previous studies in the "Origins," our thanks and appreciation.

It requires, however, intellectual fortitude to affirm that the development of religion from lower to higher conceptions derives no solid evidence from the sciences of Language, Prehistoric archæology, and Comparative Religions. There is a fundamental difference between the view of the history of Religion given by Professor Kellogg and that of Max Müller, D'Alviella, Réville, and many others who bring to the study of the origin and development of Religion the vast mass of evidence gained from Biology, Anthropology, Linguistic Palæontology, Ethnology, and Biblical Criticism.

That man has started from a lower form of life with divine potencies of mind, morality, and religion, and under providential guidance has pursued an ever advancing career of psychic and religious historic development, culminating in the realization of Christianity, is not, for Dr. Kellogg, a true or cheering conception of human destiny. The facts of sin and redemption are not irreconcilable with evolutionary religion; but the lecturer, in his loyalty to the truth of those facts, assumes that they are. The relics of a venerable tradition which certainly are found in literatures much older than the story of Genesis, and which the Hebrew writer was inspired to mould into theistic form, are made to stand as literal authority for the 'fall of man.' It is upon the authority of this account that man is claimed to have been an intelligent monotheist and to have lapsed into animism, fetishism, and polytheism. History, according to this view, is a pessimistic story of man. Primitive man, starting upon his march through time with a true conception of the Divine Unity and in holy fellowship with God, in spite of this stupendous advantage, enters at once upon a continuous descent, and "animism, polytheism, pantheism, atheism, and all other forms of religion or religious philosophy, must be regarded as various forms of degeneration from that primitive faith" of monotheism.

Anthropologists are more and more convinced that the psychology of the individual and that of the race reveal the same laws of development. The lower stages of conscious life of the individual cast light upon the early stages of primitive consciousness. Aristotle, with penetrating genius and using such materials as he could command, shows how one form of the mental manifestations constitute the basis of another. And the analogy is now made apparent, by a sound and Christian theory of evolution, between the life of the individual and that of the race in successive generations.

In the first Lecture, the question is asked, "What is Religion?" and various definitions are examined in a satisfactory way. The definition of Dr. Kellogg may be accepted as, on the whole, the best one. The second Lecture, on Fetishism and Animism, reveals at once the conviction of the author that these stages of belief are not steps of an upward, but of a downward movement. The third Lecture deals with Herbert Spencer's ghost theory, which requires no special notice, as hardly any one dealing now with the History of Religion accepts it as more than a partial account of the origin of Religions. The fourth Lecture is devoted to a criticism of the theory of Professor Max Müller, that of Henotheism. If Professor Müller in the ardor of popular discourse is sometimes delphic in his statements, it is not difficult, I think, to understand his argument in the main. His theory of the origin of the concept of Deity, and of religion, has always seemed to

me a noble one, which Christian theists should welcome as an attempt to rescue religious concepts from the exclusive claims of animists of the extreme type.

In the fifth Lecture, "On the True Genesis of Religion," the argument is as strong as possible, perhaps, from the standpoint of original monotheism. But that view, so far as it postulates a man in Eden who was a monotheist of the type implied in modern theism, has been sapped and mined by the correlative sciences of human development. Indeed, Professor Kellogg intimates more than once, that the original monotheism was an elementary one, and were it not for the misunderstanding of Professor Max Müller's position, whereby sensationalism is made the source of the whole religious content, Dr. Kellogg's argument would seem to be identical with that of Professor Müller. For he says, "We find, then, the origin of religion in these two factors: the one, subjective, the other objective; the former, the constitution of *man's* nature, in virtue of which he necessarily believes in the existence of a Power invisible and supernatural, to which he stands necessarily related; the latter, in the actual revelation of such a Power in the phenomena of conscience, and in the physical universe without us." If the fact of sin can be reconciled with his own view of man's original concept of Deity, it is equally reconcilable with Professor Müller's. The progress of the child in intellectual and moral perception more and more clearly reveals the fact of sin. Many persons are to-day found in Christendom who seem to be monotheists, animists, and fetishists in the various moods of religious feeling. The primitive man trying to grasp the unitary concept of Deity—call it the 'Infinite' or the 'Universal Power'—may have had moods in which animism and polytheism played their part.

But the Divine education is one of progress, not one of disaster. The advance of the consciousness of sin and need of redemption is parallel with the advance from inferior to higher intelligence and moral perceptions.

Dr. Kellogg's book is a valuable contribution to the History and Philosophy of Religion. The scholarship manifested is worthy of respect. A generous candor is shown in the collection of historic illustrations which sometimes tell against his argument. The only contention one may have with the Lectures is that the point of view throws the facts of progressive history out of perspective. Christianity is, or ought to be, the most cheerful philosophy of religion, and Scripture, indeed, itself teaches us that there has been a progress of man from the beginning, under heavenly guidance.

CHARLES MELLEN TYLER.